



STATE OF WASHINGTON

**STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL**

906 Columbia Street SW • P.O. Box 48350 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8350 •  
(360) 725-2967

**MINUTES  
MECHANICAL, VENTILATION & ENERGY  
CODES COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL**

**Date:** May 17, 2002

**Location:** Raad 5, Olympia

**Committee Members Present:** Stan Price, Chair; Bill Misocky, Vice Chair; Terry Poe; Dave Saunders; Dale Shafer

**Other Council Members Present:** Dave Baker

**Committee Members Absent:** Rick Ford, Jim Lewis

**Visitors Present:** Chuck Murray, Larry Andrews, Nolan West, Brian Minnich, John Hogan

**Staff Present:** Tim Nogler, Krista Braaksma, Al Rhoades, Patti Thorn, Sue Mathers

**CALL TO ORDER**

Stan Price, Chair of the Mechanical, Ventilation and Energy Codes Committee, called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Stan welcomed everyone. Introductions were made.

**REVIEW AND APPROVE AGENDA**

Krista Braaksma added review and approval of the minutes of the March 8, 2002 Committee meeting to today's agenda. With that addition the agenda was approved.

## REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES

Terry Poe amended the minutes of the March 8 meeting to reflect his attendance. With that addition the minutes were approved.

## INTERPRETATION REQUESTS

### **Interpretation No. 02-May 01, Department of Labor & Industries (L&I)**

Krista explained that this interpretation asks whether enclosures for ATM machines that have heating and/or cooling equipment are exempt from the Washington State Energy Code (WSEC). The proposed answer is that these enclosures are not exempt and thus must meet the requirements of the WSEC. Krista said Exception 4 of Section 1301 exempts “personal wireless service facilities” solely and does not include other types of equipment shelters.

Dale Shafer expressed concern about the word “enclosure.” He believes it may be loosely interpreted and extrapolated to enclosures for drink machines that have heating and cooling. Thus he prefers “buildings” in place of “enclosures.”

#### **Motion #1:**

**Dale Shafer moved to amend the answer in draft Interpretation No. 02-May 01 to read: “Yes. Buildings that house ATM machines are not exempted by the code.” Bill Misocky seconded the motion.**

Dave Saunders, while not necessarily disagreeing, noted the next logical question is “What is a building?” Dale answered that “building” is defined in the building code as “a structure used or intended for supporting or sheltering any use or occupancy.” Tim noted that in the case of an ATM, use rather than occupancy makes the WSEC applicable.

Speaking in favor of Dale’s motion, Stan agreed with tightening the definition of “enclosures.” **He suggested however expanding “buildings” to say “buildings or portions thereof.” Dale accepted that suggestion as a friendly amendment.** Dave Saunders also spoke in favor of a tighter definition.

Krista asked for confirmation that Dale’s intent is to strike everything in the proposed answer after the second sentence. Dale confirmed that is his intent. It was agreed that the remainder is an explanation, not an answer.

Dave Baker asked why “personal wireless service facilities” exempted in Section 1301 are different. Krista said she reviewed that exemption, and it’s based solely on the fact that they are “personal wireless switching stations.” Tim said at the time the exemption was adopted there was a definition of “personal wireless service facility” in the WSEC.

It's specific to antennas. Krista agreed that was done to narrow the scope of the exemption.

Dave Baker said that he thinks the exemption for personal wireless service facilities should be extended to similar structures, which he sees ATM enclosures as being. Bill Misocky recalled some discussion that occurred when the exemption for personal wireless service facilities was adopted. The equipment in those facilities actually causes a heating excess. Thus more cooling is required in those facilities than the WSEC allows. Stan vaguely recalled the same thing. He cautioned against indiscriminately extending the exemption.

Presenting options, Stan asked the Committee's pleasure. Krista said the draft interpretation has been pending since March, and L&I is anxious for an answer. From his personal experience, Dave Saunders recommended issuing the interpretation but tickling it for further review and possible action. He prefers addressing problems by amending the code rather than by issuing interpretations. Dale agreed.

**The question was called for. Motion #1 as amended was unanimously adopted.**

**Interpretation Nos. 02-May 02 through 02-May 07, City of Seattle**

Tim said these draft interpretations deal with Chapter 14, the nonresidential portion of the WSEC. Stan noted there has been some background work on this package of interpretations, including Dale Shafer, Tim and Energy TAG members.

Terry asked if manufacturers actually perform a jacket loss test on furnaces. Dale answered that some do. Stan said the jacket heat loss test is a portion of the new ASHRAE standard. Larry Andrews questioned whether major manufacturers are knowledgeable about the new ASHRAE standard. Stan noted the standard establishing minimum efficiencies was amended in 1999 so all manufacturers are manufacturing their equipment lines to meet or exceed those levels. Tim pointed out the jacket heat loss test applies to nonresidential furnaces over 225,000 BTU.

**Motion #2:**

**Dale Shafer moved that draft Interpretation Nos. 02-May 02, 02-May 03, 02-May 04, 02-May 05, 02-May 06 and 02-May 07 be adopted as written. Bill Misocky seconded the motion.**

Terry expressed discomfort about the jacket heat loss test. Stan quoted ASHRAE 6.2.1, Mechanical Equipment Efficiencies Mandatory Provisions: "All furnaces with input ratings, including electric furnaces, shall have jacket losses not exceeding 0.75 percent of the input ratings." He said Table 6.2.1A specifies the test procedures that are required to meet those jacket loss tests. Washington's WSEC exactly duplicates that table. Dale said he checked with Resoner about their rooftop equipment. Their equipment is listed as duct furnaces, thus they meet the 1.5 percent requirement for duct furnaces. Dale noted

the WSEC requirement is restricted to equipment listed as warm air furnaces. Terry said he no longer has concerns.

**The question was called for. Motion #2 was unanimously adopted.**

## **STAFF REPORT**

Tim advised Committee members that a records request has been made for the rulemaking file of the Energy Code. Stan added that concerns have been raised by Vulcan Enterprises, a Seattle developer, about the application of new residential energy code requirements to high-rise, multifamily projects. Stan has met with Vulcan on several occasions. Design flexibility allowed Vulcan in the WSEC is being pointed out to them, and they're exploring options. Ongoing negotiation will hopefully resolve Vulcan's problems.

Tim reminded members of the June 14 Spokane meeting. He said the mailing for that meeting will be completed May 24. A possible administrative remedy of Vulcan's concerns will be discussed at the Spokane meeting. Tim asked Stan if he would like to also consider the interpretation tabled at the March meeting. Stan noted that tabled interpretation, dealing with flexibility in systems analysis in the energy code, is tied to the Vulcan issue. He would like Dale, unable to attend the Spokane meeting, available for decisionmaking. John Hogan agreed that no action on that interpretation in June is okay.

Lacking further business, Stan adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m.